

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,755	09/17/2001	Taro Takahashi	225-01	8898
27569	7590 07/29/2004		EXAMINER	
PAUL AND	PAUL THOUSAND MARKET :	PRATT, HELEN F		
	PHIA, PA 19103	SIREEI	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1761	
		DATE MAIL ED. 07/20/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N	0.	Applicant(s)				
_	09/936,755		TAKAHASHI ET A	L. '			
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
	Helen F. Pratt		1761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the co	ver sheet with the c	correspondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ju	une 2004.						
	action is non-	final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	cepted or b) drawing(s) be hetion is required i	eld in abeyance. Se f the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CI				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D Notice of Informal F		D-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/936,755

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The finality of the last office action is withdrawn due to the reference found below which was found on a search to update the previous search.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christiansen et al. (WO 97/03574).

Christiansen discloses an acidic protein beverage as in claims 4, 7 and 8, which contains a low-molecularized pectin (LMP) at a concentration of 0.35%. The original pectin has been treated with an enzyme to de-esterify it (abstract and page 64, lines 15-24). The viscosity is less than 150 mPa's in a solution. In a whey-containing beverage, the modified pectin was used as in claim 5. As a pectin having the claimed viscosity was used in yoghurt and similar results were found in a whey beverage, it is seen that it would have been within the skill of the ordinary worker to arrive at near the claimed viscosities using the modified pectin's of the reference. No patentable distinction is seen in the use of a 5% solution verses a 4% solution (concentration 0.35%) of the reference because the reference discloses that an increase in the amounts of pectin makes a more viscous yoghurt. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use a low-

Application/Control Number: 09/936,755

Art Unit: 1761

molecularized pectin to make a product with decreased viscosity as shown by the reference to Christensen et al.

Claim 5 is to the process of adding the LMP to an acidic protein, which is a whey beverage. As above the amount has been shown and the viscosity is within the claimed mPa's (page 64, lines 15-30 and page 65, lines 25-30, page 66, 67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to add the claimed pectin to acidic beverages as shown by Christianson et al.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishman et al. (6,143,337).

Fishman et al. disclose a process of making a heated pectin by heating the pectin at 100 C and above (abstract and col. 2, lines 48-58). Claim 6 differs from the reference in that a non-LMP is used with the acidic protein food, and heated to 100 C. and above. However, as it is known to heat pectin to this temperature, nothing new or unobvious is seen in heating it with other ingredients, as the pectin would have still acted in the same way. Nothing is seen that the LMP would not have had the claimed viscosity as the process is known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to heat at the claimed temperature as shown by Fishman et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen F. Pratt whose telephone number is 571-272-1404. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

Application/Control Number: 09/936,755

Art Unit: 1761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Milton Cano, can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hp 7-19-04

HELEN PRATT
PRIMARY EXAMINER